



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

ml

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/625,421	07/25/2000	George D. Dumbaugh	1112-1017.1	6645

7590

04/04/2002

Jeffrey R Gray
Lee Mann Smith McWilliams Sweeney & Ohlson
P O Box 2786
Chicago, IL 60690-2786

EXAMINER

KING, BRADLEY T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3683

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/625,421

Applicant(s)
Dumbaugh

Examiner
Bradley King

Art Unit
3683



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jan 29, 2002
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on Jan 29, 2002 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 3683

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dumbaugh et al (4149627) in view of Rosenstrom.

Dumbaugh et al discloses an apparatus including: a vibratory apparatus with a bed 111, a plurality of inclined stabilizers 115, each stabilizer having a first end, a second end and a longitudinal axis, the first end of each stabilizer being attached to the bed. Dumbaugh et al lack the disclosure of two separate pairs of freewheeling eccentric weights. Rosenstrom teaches a control system and plurality of motor and weight pairs in a vibratory apparatus. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the motors and control system of Rosenstrom in the bed structure of Dumbaugh et al to provide operation and control through multiple vibratory modules, thereby reducing the cost and increasing the durability of the system.

Art Unit: 3683

Regarding claim 2, Dumbaugh disclose a plurality of drive springs 114.

Regarding claim 6, Dumbaugh et al disclose a counterbalance 116.

Regarding claim 7, Dumbaugh et al disclose isolation springs 117.

Regarding claims 8 and 16, the modification of the spring rates and the motor/weight characteristics is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify either through routine experimentation and optimization to achieve the desired movement.

Regarding claims 17-18, Rosenstrom teach controller 60 for changing the speed of the motors.

3. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dumbaugh in view of Venanzetti.

Dumbaugh et al discloses an apparatus including: a vibratory apparatus with a bed 111, a plurality of inclined stabilizers 115, each stabilizer having a first end, a second end and a longitudinal axis, the first end of each stabilizer being attached to the bed. Dumbaugh et al lack the disclosure of two separate pairs of freewheeling eccentric weights. Venanzetti teaches a plurality of motor and weight pairs in a vibratory apparatus. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a plurality of motor and weight pairs as taught by Venanzetti in the bed structure of Dumbaugh et al to reduce the stress in the structure, thereby increasing the durability of the device.

Regarding claim 2, Dumbaugh disclose a plurality of drive springs 114.

Art Unit: 3683

Regarding claim 6, Dumbaugh et al disclose a counterbalance 116.

Regarding claim 7, Dumbaugh et al disclose isolation springs 117.

Regarding claims 8 and 16, the modification of the spring rates and the motor/weight characteristics is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify either through routine experimentation and optimization to achieve the desired movement.

Regarding claims 17-18, Dumbaugh et al teach changing the speed of the motors (column 3, lines 1-17).

Response to Arguments


4. Applicant's arguments filed 1/29/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With regards to Rosenstrom, it is maintained that Rosenstrom has freewheeling eccentric weights. The instant application appears to define "freewheeling" as lacking physical or mechanical linkage with regards to rotation. The weights of Rosenstrom fulfil this definition. One pair of weights can be rotated without the other. While (in operation) the pairs of weights are controlled by a control system to rotate together, they are not physically or mechanically linked. The weight pairs of Rosenstrom and the instant application are structurally equivalent. Also, both the device of Rosenstrom and that of the instant application aim to synchronize the rotation of multiple weight pairs in operation. It is maintained that the rejection is proper.

Art Unit: 3683

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley King whose telephone number is (703)308-8346.


JACK LAVINDER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600
4/1/02

BTK

March 29, 2002